SINGLE BENCH

(4)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION No. 6789 /2006

Petitioner : Dilip Singh Thakur
S/o Sita Ram Singh Thakur, Aged about 43 years, Asst. Teacher, Primary School, Mainpuri, Block-Kawardha District – Kabirdham (C.G.)

P.R. No.....
Presented by Shri.....
dated.....

Versus

Respondents :

1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through : Secretary School Education Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

2. District Education Officer
Kabirdham (C.G.)

3. Block Education Officer
Block – Kawardha, District – Kabirdham (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY
30/11/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(21)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

W. P. (S) No. 6789 of 2006

Petitioner : Dilip Singh Thakur

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh & others

Present: Mr. Deepak Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel lawyer for the respondents/State.

ORDER

(Passed on 13th day of December, 2006)

1. The petitioner was appointed as Assistant Teacher, wherein, it was provided that the petitioner would be granted pay scale of Rs. 975-25-1000-30-1210-40-1450-50-1650/-, after a period of one year. It was further provided that the petitioner would be entitled to the fixed pay of Rs. 300/- for a period of one year.
2. Similarly situated employees had approached the Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal. The Tribunal passed the order on 24.8.1992 in O.A. No. 2745 of 1989 (Madhukant Yadu and 56 others Vs. State of M.P. & others.)
3. It was further held that the said benefit would be given to all teachers and they should not be compelled to approach the Tribunal for similar benefit individually or collectively.

4. Being aggrieved, the then State of Madhya Pradesh had filed the Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 6892/93 impugning the order dated 24.8.1992 passed by the Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal, Jabalpur in O.A. No. 2745/89. The Hon'ble Supreme Court after hearing learned counsel for the parties, dismissed the Special Leave Petition and having regard to the large financial implications, granted one year's time to settle the claim for the arrears without interest vide order dated 3.1.1994. It was further observed that the intervention would work out their rights in accordance with law. This order dated 24.8.1992 passed by the Tribunal in O.A. No. 2745/1989 is applicable to the petitioners being similarly situated and they are accordingly entitled to the same benefit.

5. For the above stated reasons, the petitioner is granted liberty to make a representation to consider the case of the petitioner if it stands on the same footings as per order dated 24.8.1992 by the Madhya Pradesh State Administrative Tribunal, Jabalpur in O.A. No. 2745/89 (Madhukant Yadu and 56 others Vs. State of M.P. & others.) and subsequently confirmed by order dated 3.1.1994 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 6892/93 and grant relief accordingly.

6. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge